

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 15, 17, 18, 36-48 and 75-91, 98, and 100-102 are pending in the application, with claims 15, 75, 88, 101 and 102 being the independent claims. Claim 43 was amended to correct a typographical error and not for reasons related to patentability. The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 15, 17, 18, 36, 37, 48 and 75-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,643,087 to Marcus et al. ("the Marcus Patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,912,661 to Siddiqui ("the Siddiqui patent") or U.S. Patent No. 5,724,106 to Autry et al. ("the Autry patent"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons set forth below. Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's position with respect to the arguments set forth in the previous response and reserve the right to pursue those arguments in subsequent responses.

Independent Claim 15 and its Dependent Claims

The invention as recited in independent claim 15 includes an apparatus including a sensor "configured to send data associated with a rotation of [a] rotatable member to at least one electronic device" where "each of [a plurality of] selectively actuated functions [of the electronic device are] selectable based on a displacement of said rotatable member." The claim further recites that "the haptic force sensation [is] associated with a selected one of the plurality of functions."

The Marcus patent discloses an input device that includes a user-manipulated controller that is capable of receiving force-feedback based on particular game scenarios (e.g., depending

on the type of plane simulated in a flight simulator). The Siddiqui patent discloses a mouse that includes a user-manipulated roller used to scroll through a graphical display.

The Marcus patent and the Siddiqui patent, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a “haptic force sensation being associated with a selected one of the plurality of functions” where the function is selected by displacement of a rotatable member. There is no suggestion in either of the references of outputting a haptic force sensation associated with a selected function.

For at least this reason, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Accordingly, independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited references. At least based on their dependence upon independent claim 15, dependent claims 17, 18 and 48 are also allowable.

Independent Claim 75 and its Dependent Claims

The invention recited in independent claim 75 includes “outputting a haptic force sensation to the rotatable member via an actuator coupled to the rotatable member, the haptic force sensation associated with a selected one of a plurality of functions associated with the electronic device.” As discussed above with respect to independent claim 15, both the Marcus patent and the Siddiqui patent, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “outputting a haptic force sensation . . . associated with a selected one of a plurality of functions” as recited in claim 75.

For at least this reason, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Accordingly, independent claim 75 is allowable over the cited references. At least based on their dependence upon independent claim 75, dependent claims 76, 77 and 86 are also allowable.

Dependent Claims 36, 37, 78 and 79

Claims 36, 37, 78 and 79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Marcus patent in view of the Siddiqui patent, and further in view of the Autry patent. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claims 15 or 75, which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, dependent claims 36, 37, 78 and 79 are also allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in the application.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Date: September 22, 2003

By:



Erik B. Milch
Reg. No. 42,887

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston Town Center
Reston, Virginia 20190-5656
(703) 456-8000 – Phone
(703) 456-8100 – Facsimile